



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SACRIFICES.

BY REV. HOWARD CROSBY, D. D., LL. D.,

New York.

It is customary to regard the '*olah*' (or burnt-offering) as signifying consecration, while the sin-offering represents expiation. I would suggest that expiation is the only idea in all the bloody sacrifices. The offerer puts his hand on the victim of the '*olah*', just as on any other victim; and that this putting on of the hand means a transfer of his sin to the victim there can be no doubt (see Lev. XVI., 21). The killing, cutting up and burning of a victim, and then the sprinkling or pouring of its blood around the altar were certainly significant of wrath, punishment and death. There was nothing of the nature of a gift to God in all this,—no notion of consecration. The whole scene was terrible, while consecration is beautiful.

What then was the difference between the '*olah*' (burnt-offering) and the '*chatta'th*' (sin-offering), the '*asham*' (trespass-offering) and the '*zebhach shelamim*' (peace-offering)? Simply this. The '*chatta'th*' (of which the '*asham*' was a species) was the individual sin brought (in the person of the animal) to the altar to be slain, while the '*olah*' was the general depravity of the man, underlying the individual sin, brought to be consumed. Hence a burnt-offering ('*olah*') accompanied every sin-offering ('*chatta'th*'), because every offerer would offer expiation first for his special sin and then for his wickedness in general.

The priests ate the sin-offering, excepting the fat, which was burned, because that represented the offerer's sin only; but they did not eat any of the burnt-offering, because that represented human depravity in general, in which they participated. So all of the '*olah*' was burned.

In the peace-offering ('*zebhach shelamim*'), we have, after the expiation on the altar, the eating, of priests and offerer, from the remainder, signifying the peace and communion with God obtained by the expiation. My scheme of the sacrifices, then, is this:—

' <i>Olah</i>	expiation of general depravity.
' <i>Chatta'th</i> }	expiation of special sins.
' <i>Asham</i> }	
' <i>Zebhach shelamim</i> ..expiation and communion.	

The '*minchah*' (meat-offering) and '*neseq*' (drink-offering) were mere accompaniments of the sacrifices, representing food and drink, the soul's nourishment through the expiatory grace of God.

Because *'olah* is used with the verb *'alah*, we think that the noun must be cognate with the verb, and hence *'olah* must mean "that which is lifted up;" but it is quite possible that a verb of similar sound should be made to accompany a noun when not cognate, the ear, not the sense, directing; as when, in English, a gourmand after dinner says "I *feel full*," or an evil doer says "I *will well*, but I act ill." Now as *'olah* (burnt-offering) is written with a *warw* after the initial *'ayin* (i. e., with a fully-written long *o*)* four times in the Pentateuch, and forty-three times elsewhere, why may it not be the same as *'awlah*† (wickedness), which we find as *'olah* also in several places? I see no good reason why the *'olah* may not be the *wickedness*-offering, just as the *chatta'th* is the sin-offering, and the *'asham* is the trespass-offering. By the way, the word "offering" leads the English reader astray. It should not be appended to these presentations. *Qarabh qorban* means "to present a presentation." It is not giving a gift. The *minchah* is a gift, which God accepts after the presentation of an expiation.

There was just one idea in all bloody sacrifices,—*expiation by a suffering substitute*. The gifts and communion and consecration were all sequels and results.

The *somata*, in Rom. XII., 1, are our *sins* (see Col. III., 5 for the same idea) to be destroyed, not our souls to be consecrated.

THE PROPER ATTITUDE OF THE MINISTRY TOWARDS BIBLICAL CRITICS.

BY REV. B. F. SIMPSON,

Duluth, Minn.

It must be well-known that this form of biblical study and research known as the Higher Criticism is prominently before the reading public of to-day. Although certain phases of the subject can be properly dealt with only by an advanced scholarship, yet such is the importance of the question and the documents of which it treats, that it is of necessity a popular one. Men are thinking on this subject in all directions to-day. It meets us on every hand; and the question is not, Shall we pay any attention to it? We dare not ignore it; for that will be equivalent to a surrender of our position, whatever that position may be. The true question for us to ask to-day is, What shall be our position with respect to this department of inquiry, and

* עולה † עולה